UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
In Re: 05-44481 (RDD)
DELPHI CORPORATION, et al., One Bowling Green
New York, New York Debtors. April 30, 2008
X
TRANSCRIPT OF MOTIONS BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT D. DRAIN UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE
APPEARANCES:
For the Debtors: JOHN WM. BUTLER, JR., ESQ.
KAYALYN A. MARAFIOTI, ESQ. THOMAS J. MATZ, ESQ.
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom, LLP
Four Times Square New York, New York 10036
For Creditors Com.: ROBERT J. ROSENBERG, ESQ.
MICHAEL RIELA, ESQ. Latham & Watkins
885 Third Avenue New York, New York 10022
For Equity Com.: BONNIE STEINGART, ESQ. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver
& Jacobson, LLP One New York Plaza
New York, New York 10004
For ADAH: THOMAS E. LAURIA, ESQ. White & Case, LLP
200 South Biscayne Boulevard Miami, Florida 33131
(Appearances continued on next page)
REGENCY REPORTING, INC. Certified Court Reporters & Videographers
425 Eagle Rock Avenue 575 Madison Avenue Roseland, NJ 07068 New York, NY 10022
www.regencyreporting.net 1-866-268-7866
<u> </u>

. 1	APPEARANCES CONTINUED:	
2	For Tenneco:	MICHELLE R. MANHA, ESQ. Mayer Brown, LLP
3		1675 Broadway New York, New York 10019
4		New lork, New lork 10019
5	For Delphi Corp.: Essex Group, Inc.	
6	EBSCA Croup, The.	Friedman, Kaplan, Seiler & Adelman 1633 Broadway
7		New York, New York 10019
8	For JP Morgan:	BRIAN M. RESNICK, ESQ. Davis, Polk & Wardwell
9		450 Lexington Avenue New York, New York 10017
10	Court Transcriber:	
11	ocale framsorisci.	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18 19	<u>.</u>	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

THE COURT: Please be seated. Okay. Delphi Corporation.

2.1

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, good morning. Jack Butler,
Kayalyn Marafioti and Tom Matz from Skadden, Arps here on behalf of
Delphi Corporation for our thirtieth omnibus hearing.

Your Honor, we have filed an agenda with ten items on the agenda for today and we propose to proceed in the order of the agenda.

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, the first matter on the agenda, matter No. 1, is the Steering Sale motion objections, the follow on objections to the Steering Sale at docket No. 11390.

As Your Honor may recall, we received a total of 44 objections to the sale hearing, nine of those were resolved prior to the sale hearing, 28 of those were resolved prior to the subsequent hearing on March 19th that had been scheduled to consider them. That left us with seven objections that we had to deal with; five objections that had been adjourned to the April 2nd claims hearing and two objections that were adjourned to this hearing. Of those seven objections, three have now been resolved, that is the Hydro Aluminum North America, Inc. objection at docket No. 12452. There's a stipulation and agreed order at docket No. 13291. The Dupont objection at docket No. 12464 which has now had an entered stipulation and agreed order at docket No. 13405 and an objection filed by Frudenberg, Nolk, a general partnership, on

. 1 behalf of the various entities at docket No. 12479 and that 2 objection was withdrawn at docket No. 13282. That leaves us now 3 with four remaining objections; two of those were adjourned to the 4 April 2nd claims hearing and Your Honor adjourned those already to 5 the May 8th hearing and then two others; one filed by -- both filed 6 actually by American Aikoku Alpha, Inc. at docket No. 12369 and 7 12376 remains for this hearing. 8 Your Honor, American Aikoku has a motion pending at the 9 May 8th claims hearing relating to its claims and to allow for a 10 settlement to resolve all of its outstanding issues which would 11 resolve these two objections, among others, if in fact that motion 12 is granted. As a result, Your Honor, we'd like to adjourn these 13 two objections to the May 2nd hearing. We'll take up the four 14 remaining Steering Sale objections at the May 8th claims hearing if that's acceptable, Your Honor. 15 16 THE COURT: All right. That's fine. 17 These are -- even though you're saying they're 18 objections to the Steering Sale, they're either a cure or 19 assumption or an assignment objection? 20 MR. BUTLER: Yes, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Okay. All right. So I'll deal with that in 22 May. 23 MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Your Honor. 24 Your Honor, similarly, item No. 2 on the agenda which is

the Omitted Contracts Assumption Procedures motion, filed at docket

25

No. 13029, was filed because Delphi identified additional contracts that needed to be noticed out. There was an Omitted Contracts
Assumption Procedures order entered by the Court on March 25th at docket No. 13232 and pursuant to that we sent notices of assumption, assignment and cure with respect to 150 additional contracts. We've received six objections out of the 150 and of those six objections one has been withdrawn, four are settled and are being based on various stipulations, some of them that are being drafted right now, and the final one with Federal Screw Works at docket No. 13356 remains open and we're negotiating with them.

We'd like Your Honor to adjourn all six of these objections and just for the record they're docket Nos. 13343, 13344, 13356, 13358, 13364 and 13373. Those six objections we'd like to adjourn to the May 8th claims hearing so we can complete the resolution of these objections in a consensual manner. We would expect, Your Honor, that the vast majority of the paperwork will be done on all of these by that time.

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, the balance of the matters on the docket today are all either procedural motions or substantive motions that are designed to continue to stabilize and protect the business as we move forward in evaluating modifications to our plan of reorganization and otherwise considering actions to take with respect to the closing that was commenced but not completed on

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

April 4th. We have been in very close consultation with our statutory committees on all of these matters and I'm pleased that we have the committees' support on matters we're presenting to you today and I'll walk through each of them with the Court.

The first at item No. 3 is the Fifth 365(d)(4) Extension motion, which under the prior orders of the Court at docket No. 12878, the time to assume or reject leases would have expired on the early or the effective date of the plan or May 31, 2008. We filed a request for an extension that would essentially extend out the deadline now to the effective date of the plan that's already been confirmed or the effective date of any modified plan subject to the terms of such plan and corresponding confirmation order including any elections to assume or reject real property leases that might be permitted thereunder. This relief impacts approximately eighty real property leases. As Your Honor may recall, under the plan and disclosure statement that is currently extant the company assumed all of those leases. There were no leases under plan Exhibit 8-1-A that were set for rejection. While obviously the company in connection with any modifications would have the right to consider modifications, the company has no present intention of doing so.

No lessor filed an objection to the relief requested, no party has filed an objection to the relief requested, Your Honor, and we'd ask Your Honor to enter the order that's been proposed.

THE COURT: Okay. I have no problem with an extension

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and obviously the lessors didn't either. My review of the proposed exclusivity order, though, prompted me to look at this a little more carefully notwithstanding that it was consensual and let me just raise with you an issue that, I think, may require a slight change to the order given -- again, the order is intended to protect assets of the debtors -- protect against the automatic rejection of leases and the exclusivity order as proposed at least contemplates the possibility of someone other than the debtors filing a plan. Those issues are reserved, obviously, for the future and I expect that everyone will continue to try and work together to have a consensual modification of the plan but it's conceivable that someone other than the debtor could propose a plan and get one confirmed and as I read 1127 if this is limited just to the plan or any modified plan, I think it's just limited to the proponent of the plan which would be the debtors so you would run a risk, however remote, that if someone else got a plan confirmed these leases would be deemed rejected.

So I took out the phrase, "modified plan," and just said, "any other Chapter 11 plan" and that would protect the estates and I think it's consistent with what you noticed out to everyone who, I'm sure, assumed that this issue would be put off until confirmation unless they have their right to come in and seek a shortened period.

MR. BUTLER: Certainly, Your Honor, I understand the Court's modification of the proposed order, you know, and we have

in our discussions with our committees, you know, deferred to another day the ultimate discussion about what rights the parties have with respect to modification of the plan.

THE COURT: No, I appreciate that. This is just to be protective as opposed to in any way accelerate that discussion.

MR. BUTLER: Right. And I presume the changes are being made, Your Honor, with the full reservation of rights to all the parties to argue that on the other issues.

THE COURT: Sure. Yes. Absolutely. No, this is just
- it comes up in connection with the 4(m) motion, too, but with

that change which I, again, believe is fully consistent with what

you noticed out because I think the lessors, I'm sure, didn't take

the time to read 1127 and go through that analysis, they just

assumed that this would probably be put off until confirmation of

some plan or the effective date of some plan and they obviously

have their right to come in for cause if they want to.

Okay. So with that change I'll approve it.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, speaking of exclusivity, that actually is the next motion, item No. 4 on the agenda, the motion to further extend exclusivity at docket No. 13360.

As Your Honor may recall, our current exclusivity order which was obtained on a precautionary basis at the time because it was post-confirmation provided that we would have the exclusive right to file a plan through and including May 31, 2008 and to

solicit acceptances of the plan through and including July 31, 2008.

We've had informal discussions with both representatives of the plan investors and representatives of the statutory committees with respect to the motion. There were no objections filed with respect to the motion by any party. Let me just recap the discussions we've had. With respect to the discussion we had with White & Case on behalf of ADAH, we agreed to make the following statement on the record: Neither ADH's [sic] lack of a formal objection to the exclusivity extension motion nor any findings or conclusions made in connection with the motion will be used by any party in any future litigation regarding the investment agreement or any alleged act, omission or event in connection therewith including without limitation ADH's prior notices of termination. We agreed to make that statement on the record and have now done so.

THE COURT: Okay.

. 1

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, with respect to the exclusivity motion, the relief we had asked for is that, similarly, to the other procedural motions here that the Court extend the deadline until -- to file a plan or modification -- to file a plan of reorganization until thirty days after substantial consummation of the Plan or any modifications to the plan that's already been confirmed and then also extend the solicitation deadline by a corresponding ninety days.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

No one filed an objection to that. In connection with the statutory committees, both of the committees as to the official committees believe that it was appropriate to have a specific deadline and a reservation of rights to consider these matters and we agreed with them and so as to the committees the date by which exclusivity would be extended as to the two statutory committees would be August 31, 2008 and the solicitation deadline would be extended to October 31, 2008. The extension as between the debtors and the statutory committees remain subject to motions to shorten or lengthen that period for cause and as to the statutory committees and the debtors, they have agreed between themselves to reserve their rights to address if any of the exclusive periods actually were to expire whether a Section 1129(c) would then be operative in connection with controlling who might be able to file and solicit a competing plan of reorganization but we would put that off to another day, seeing as it's an academic discussion at the moment given the agreements between the parties.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BUTLER: So we did revise the order in connection with those agreements and submitted a revised order to Your Honor earlier yesterday afternoon, I believe.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Does anyone want to be heard on this?

(No response)

THE COURT: All right. I've reviewed the motion and the

revised blacklined order and I'll grant the motion. It appears to me the debtors have been acting in good faith. They obviously still have remaining issues in respect of the plan and/or a modification thereof and, consequently, this extension which, again, is consensual on this basis is warranted. So I'll enter that order.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, you also touched briefly on the 4(m) motion. That's actually the next one, Item 5. This is the post-confirmation extension of avoidance action service deadlines motion at docket No. 13361 and, Your Honor, this deals with the debtor's seeking an entry of an order extending the deadline to serve process pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 7004(a) and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 4(m) that's made applicable by Bankruptcy Rule 7004(a) for avoidance actions filed in connection with the preservation of estate claims procedures order earlier entered by this Court at docket No. 12471.

We did give some specific notice in connection with this, Your Honor. We gave notice of the motion to Lenico Engineering Company, Wachovia Bank National Association and the master service list and the 2002 list. The reason that we gave specific notice to Lenico and Wachovia was because those were the only two parties that had been identified under Exhibit 7.24 of the plan as having the avoidance actions preserved under the plan and, therefore, we gave particularized notice to them of the relief

sought by the debtors. We have not given notice to the 742 other defendants therein which are under seal and it was not served on those defendants except to the extent those defendants already had placed themselves on either the master service list or the 2002 list.

There were no objections to the motion. At the moment, Your Honor, prior to Your Honor's order, we believe that it's appropriate to get a further extension. Right now, the extension is through May 31, 2008, that's Your Honor's -- a prior order entered on March 28th at docket No. 13277 and, again, the process that we're looking for here is essentially the same formulation we did in the 365(d)(4) motion and I presume with a similar modification from Your Honor, the idea here is to not have to deal with these complaints so long as we have the plan process that we're moving forward with.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, first, I continue to believe that there is good cause for the relief sought here. Except for the notice you did give I don't think any further notice is necessary under the plain terms of 9006 and the cause is obviously that the analysis so far that's represented in the motion is the same as it was when the motion was originally granted which is that these causes of action are being preserved in light of the limitations period, however, it's not presently contemplated that they will be pursued, although obviously the preservation of them means that they may be pursued but given that there's no reason for

either the debtors or the potential defendants to start to have to incur any costs in connection with the litigation so cause is shown under Rule $4\,(m)$ and 9006.

extension motion is slightly different here, I think, because it's conceivable, I guess, that a plan that I would permit someone else to submit might have a different position on avoidance actions and at which point they should be pursued. So the way I phrased it here and you're all free to chime in on this if it doesn't sound right to you is that the deadline or the extension would be until thirty days after the later of substantial consummation of the plan or any modified Chapter 11 plan and December 31, 2008. That seems to me — that was the date you had in for another matter, it will come up later and it seems far enough off so that that would be sufficient.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So I'll grant it on that basis.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, the next item on the agenda,

Item No. 6, is the debtor's second DIP extension motion filed at

docket No. 13409.

Your Honor, in this motion the debtors have sought authority to supplement the January 5, 2007 DIP order entered at docket No. 6461, the November 16, 2007 DIP extension order at docket No. 10854 and to authorize the debtors to extend the maturity date of the DIP facility to enter into related documents

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and pay certain related fees and to authorize the debtors to enter into an arrangement or an agreement with General Motors Corporation or an affiliate thereof, all as has been outlined in the motion in a notice of filing of an unredacted chart relating to the motion that was filed at docket No. 13460 and a notice of the filing of the GM agreement relating to the second DIP extension motion that was filed at docket No. 13461.

First, Your Honor, I want to deal with the notice that was given under this motion and the timing of it. The debtors filed -- worked on this motion and finalized it with the appropriate parties on the evening of April 15th intending to take advantage of Rule 1004(c)(1)(2) which permits the commencement of final hearing no earlier than fifteen days after service of the motion. The debtors filed and served the motion overnight on April 15th, everybody received it that was required to receive it, received actual service on April 16th, that day. We took an appropriate service activity to make sure that occurred. affidavit of service is in the exhibit binder which I'll go over in a few minutes that evidences that. I do note, Your Honor, that the actual docketing of the motion on the computer in the Court's docket is ten minutes past midnight on that day. So I want you to understand that that's what -- and I want to make sure the record is clear on that fact that it actually docketed here at about 12:10 a.m. on the 16th, although that ten minute delay did not effect service in any way or change in any respects the delivery of the

motion or service of the motion as contemplated under Rule 4001(c)(2).

THE COURT: I guess anyone who waited up that long would have waited another ten minutes.

MR. BUTLER: Well, Your Honor, we wanted you to be aware of it and for purposes -- because it is clear that the DIP lenders, General Motors and the debtors all expect and anticipate that this is a final hearing and we wanted to make sure that we had given the Court the proper information relating to all this and that the service to make sure that the exhibits we'll introduce in a few minutes into evidence, that the service was made overnight on the 15th and was received by everybody on the 16th.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BUTLER: The second item, Your Honor, that I wanted to describe with you is the forms of the agreement. Maybe it's best to look at the exhibit books now and I've got a couple of items to go through with Your Honor. But we do have exhibits for this particular matter. There are fifteen of them: Item No. 1 is John Sheehan's declaration in support of this. We have actually one reserved exhibit which is Exhibit 2 which is not being used for the hearing. Exhibits 3, 4 and 5 are the form of proposed credit agreement and we are using, after reviewing this with the parties, an amended and restated revolving credit term loan and guaranty agreement. I think, importantly, Exhibit No. 4 is the blackline of the amended and restated revolving credit term loan and guaranty

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

agreement against a prior agreement. Exhibit 5 is the fourth amendment fee letter that has been shared with the committees and with Your Honor. It is marked "Highly Confidential" but it is Exhibit 5. Exhibit 6 is the expedited motion. Exhibit 7 is the form of proposed order and I in fact have some comments to make about that in a few minutes because we've reached agreements with various parties this morning that would require some further alterations to that order such that we would proceed on an uncontested basis with the relief being sought today. So I'll come back to Exhibit 7 in a few minutes. Exhibits 8 and 9 are the notices of filing that I spoke about earlier and Exhibits 10 and 11 are the prior DIP orders. Exhibit 12 is a blackline of the proposed order -- the form of proposed order. Then the GM agreements, the GM settlement agreements, the GSA and the MRA are Exhibits 13 and 14 and then the affidavit of service I spoke about earlier is Exhibit 15.

With respect to the documents and in light of the fact that there are no objections that I'm aware of at least to this matter, there are some changes to the proposed form of order that I wanted to go over with the Court and there's at least one or two changes -- one change to the proposed form of credit agreement.

Let me deal with, first, Exhibit 3 which is the proposed form of credit agreement. At Page 61 and making reference to Article 4.01(a)(iv), the phrase at the end of that condition to the effectiveness which would have previously required that the order

Your Honor would consider entering today have become final and non-appealable, the phrase, "and such order shall have become final and non-appealable" has been deleted so that there can be a closing in less than the ten day period. Similarly -- and that's the only change to Exhibit 3. Similarly, a similar change to Exhibit 7 and I have a mark-up, Your Honor, which we'll submit to the Court, I'm not going to read all this into the record, but there are changes to Paragraphs 9 and 12 of the proposed form of order that simply extend parallel 364(e) protection to General Motors with respect to its agreement, again, so that they have the parallel protection that the DIP lenders already had under Paragraph 9 and they're just conforming changes to do that. There's nothing more material than that.

In addition, Your Honor, with respect to the order we have a replacement -- a substitute for Paragraph 8 of the order. Paragraph 8 is language that has been worked out with a number of the parties but including with ADAH on behalf of the plan investors and I'll simply read it as it's been revised. It states as follows: "Paragraph 5(b) of the DIP order is hereby amended by adding the following proviso to the end of such paragraph:

Provided further, notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, this order shall not modify the August 2, 2007 order authorizing and approving Delphi Appaloosa equity purchase and commitment agreement pursuant to Section 11 U.S.C. 105(a), 363(b), 503(b) and 507(a), docket No. 8856, the December 10, 2007 order under 11

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

U.S.C. 105(a), 363(b), 503(b) and 507(a) authorizing and approving Delphi Appaloosa equity purchase and commitment agreement amendment (the `EPCA Amendment Order), the Amended Investment Agreements as defined in the EPCA Amendment Order or any rights of the parties under any of the foregoing including without limitation with respect to (i) the propriety allowance or payment of any unpaid transaction expenses or post-order transaction expenses of the timing thereof or (ii) the Delphi/GM agreement, as to which the rights of all parties are hereby expressly reserved." That is a reservation of rights agreement that has been worked out that would be included and that would be the substitute Paragraph 8 of the proposed DIP order. THE COURT: Let me make sure. The Delphi/GM agreement that's referred to in that language is the same as later defined as the Delphi/GM agreement in Paragraph 12? MR. BUTLER: Yes. It's the Delphi/GM agreement that's before the Court today. THE COURT: The same one? MR. BUTLER: The same one. THE COURT: Okay. Your Honor, as to the Delphi/GM agreement MR. BUTLER: that's before the Court there were some modifications to the GM agreement since it was --THE COURT: I'm sorry, before you get to that -- so, I took this from my review but the carve out, then isn't changed as

```
1
      the motion had suggested it might be.
2
               MR. BUTLER: Correct, Your Honor.
3
               THE COURT: Subsequent negotiations have left the carve
      out under the original or the current DIP order -- the same subject
 4
      to this reservation that you just read?
6
               MR. BUTLER: Correct, Your Honor.
7
               THE COURT: Okay.
                                  Which means that if, for example, the
8
      transaction expenses are carved out it will be because of some
9
      litigation over whether they're owing?
10
               MR. BUTLER: Correct.
               THE COURT: Okay.
11
12
               MR. BUTLER: Now, Your Honor, just with one reference to
      the Delphi/GM agreement, there were some changes to that since the
13
14
      notice of filing on April 24th. Those blackline changes are
15
      referenced and are included in the exhibit binder at Tab 9.
16
               I believe, Your Honor, those were all of the changes
      that have been agreed to and are summarized and with that I would
17
18
      like to --
19
               THE COURT: Could I get the -- Exhibit 9, this is what I
20
      was given earlier; right?
21
               MR. BUTLER:
                           Yes.
22
               THE COURT: There's nothing new in that?
23
               MR. BUTLER: No. There was a blue sheet at the end and
24
      there was blacklined pages behind -- there were just a couple of
25
      blacklines.
```

```
· 1
               THE COURT: Well, let me just -
 2
               MR. BUTLER: Exhibit 9.
 3
               THE COURT: -- make sure that's the one I looked at.
                            (Pause in proceedings)
 5
               MR. BUTLER: I can pass up the blackline, Your Honor.
 6
               THE COURT: No, I'm just taking a quick look at it.
 7
                            (Pause in proceedings)
 8
               THE COURT: Okay. Not major changes by any means.
 9
               MR. BUTLER: No, Your Honor.
10
               Your Honor, with that in mind I'd like to move admission
      of Exhibits 1 through 15, excepting obviously Exhibit 2 which was
11
12
      reserved.
13
             (Debtor's Exhibit Nos. 1 and 3 through 15, Received)
14
                THE COURT: Okay. I'll admit them. Does anyone want to
15
      cross-examine Mr. Sheehan on his declaration?
16
                                 (No response)
17
                THE COURT: Okay. Very well.
18
               MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, in terms of presentation, I
      think that Mr. Sheehan's declaration and the papers we filed, I
19
2.0
      think, outline all the relevant issues that the debtors would
21
      present in their direct case in support of this. Obviously, there
22
      are just two points I think I'd like to make in summary; one of
23
      them is that we certainly appreciate the support of the lending
2.4
      community in moving forward with respect to the extension of the
25
      DIP through December 31, 2008 which was the maturity date the
```

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

debtors sought. The parties are moving forward, we are obviously in syndication now, the final commitment letters are due at the end of this week, we expect to close shortly thereafter, some time during the next ten days on this if Your Honor approves it today and we have moved forward in connection with the syndication terms that we've indicated on the notice of filing that we made earlier. Second, I simply also would express the company's appreciation to General Motors in stepping up and addressing through the GM agreement the \$600 million or so amount of advances that the debtors have advanced in connection with the GSA and the MRA over the last period of time since we entered into those agreements. Those advances by Delphi will ultimately be settled out when the GSA and the MRA become effective and the agreement by GM here simply addresses GM's support of the company in connection with and addresses, really, with respect to the advances that the debtors have made and we're very appreciative of that as well.

Your Honor, I think from a business judgment perspective -- and Mr. Sheehan has testified to it in his declaration -- clearly, extending the current DIP facility and continuing to provide adequate liquidity to Delphi's operations on a global basis is extremely relevant and important as we move forward to explore with our stakeholders appropriate modifications to the plan if any and move forward to emerge from Chapter 11 as soon as practicable.

THE COURT: Well, that's clearly the case.

I had a couple of questions that really don't go to that

. 1 issue but that's an obvious one. 2 I guess my first question is if syndication is expected 3 to be completed shortly why not wait until then? I mean why do it now? 4 5 MR. BUTLER: You mean as opposed to Friday, Your Honor? THE COURT: Yes. I mean are you confident enough that 6 7 you will have the commitments? MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, I believe that we expect that 8 we will have a fully syndicated DIP. JPM has received a number of 9 10 very substantial commitments already moving forward in connection with this. Obviously, from the company's perspective it was 11 12 extremely, we thought, relevant and important following the 13 commencement but not the completion of a plan closing date and 14 effective date back on April 4th to move promptly this month with 15 the relaunch of a DIP 10 [sic] or extension and to come in and get 16 authority for that. You can imagine that our stakeholders as well 17 as customers and suppliers want to be comfortable that the company 18 is going to have continued access to appropriate liquidity --19 THE COURT: Well, what I really wanted to hear is that 20 already have sufficient assurance from the lead that there are 21 major commitments in hand and it's expected to be completed. 22 MR. BUTLER: Yes, Your Honor, I think that is a fair 23 characterization. 24 THE COURT: Okay. Then, I guess my -- the remaining 25 questions I had are a subset of that which is what you asked me to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
approve is a DIP that's in substantial conformity with the
documents and the documents are very far along but there were three
places I just had questions: (1) I think may just be a typo
because the actual amounts are set forth later in the tranche
commitments but in the introductory statement it seems to me when
it talks about the amount it just has a bullet point and you may
want to deal with that because I don't want to approve something
where I'm approving just a bullet point because I think that
substantial conformity with a bullet point wouldn't count.
         MR. BUTLER: Right. No, Your Honor, I think as we've
indicated that the facilities --
         THE COURT: They're defined later and they're all clear.
         MR. BUTLER: -- are laid out. So we will do that, Your
Honor.
         THE COURT: Okay. So that the bullet point will be
consistent with those amounts and then the definition of "available
liquidity" has a dollar sign in brackets and in terms of what
substantial conformity means, I guess it's within a close range to
that dollar sign. That's not like a bullet point either is it?
         MR. BUTLER: No, it's not, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Okay. Then, finally, the EBITDAR covenant,
6.04.
         MR. BUTLER: Yes.
         THE COURT: The amount seemed to have been raised
substantially. Is that a covenant that the debtors believe they
```

. 1	could comfortably live with?
2	MR. BUTLER: Yes, Your Honor. As Mr. Shintai testified
3	in the declaration, this represents a negotiation that followed the
4	preparation of a DIP extension case which was modified from the
5	debtor's previous business plan and I think Mr. Sheehan is here and
6	can answer any questions about that.
7	THE COURT: Okay.
8	MR. BUTLER: But the debtors are comfortable with the
9	schedule of EBITDAR that is set forth on Page 7 on Section 6104.
10	THE COURT: So this reflects a substantial increase in
11	the debtor's EBITDAR.
12	MR. BUTLER: From prior covenants, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: From prior covenants.
14	MR. BUTLER: Yes, because the companies I mean that's
15	a result of the fact that the transformation plan continues to move
16	forward and the company's operations continue to move forward.
17	THE COURT: Okay.
18	MR. BUTLER: So that the EBITDAR that we're generating
19	now that would be the subject of this covenant is improved from the
20	beginning of the case.
21	THE COURT: Yes? That's right, Mr. Sheehan?
22	MR. SHEEHAN: Yes.
23	THE COURT: Okay. Then on the GM agreement, again, this
24	is really just in terms of my wanting to make sure I understand
25	what the parties are agreeing to here.

1 There's a good faith covenant of both borrower and GM to 2 negotiate and enter into amendments to each of the global 3 settlement agreement and the master restructuring agreement as soon as reasonably practicable? 4 5 MR. BUTLER: Yes. THE COURT: That's tracked elsewhere in the relief. 6 7 doesn't say what those amendments are supposed to be. Is there 8 some implicit understanding of what they are or is it really just 9 to negotiate in good faith? 10 MR. BUTLER: It's to negotiate in good faith, Your 11 I think, candidly, what the company is exploring with its 12 statutory committees and with General Motors and other stakeholders 13 are the circumstances under which it would be appropriate to accelerate the effectiveness of the GSA and the MRA. 14 15 THE COURT: Okav. 16 MR. BUTLER: And how and what the circumstances of those 17 are is a matter under discussion between the parties and is a part 18 of the negotiation and we've all agreed to negotiate in good faith 19 on that subject. 20 THE COURT: Okay. But this isn't sort of code words 21 for, you know, some sort of agreement in principal that the parties 22 have that I would be asked to approve now? 23 MR. BUTLER: No, Your Honor, absolutely not. 24 THE COURT: Okay. Then, last, in a couple of places

here there's a provision that first appears in "conditions to

25

1 lending" that's headed "Modifications to Existing Confirmed Plan." 2 MR. BUTLER: U-hum. 3 THE COURT: As I look through this that provision which 4 sort of spells out what can and cannot be done to the confirmed plan is not an event of default. Am I right about that? It just 6 pertains to conditions to lending? 7 MR. BUTLER: Absolutely correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. So GM and the debtors wouldn't have 8 9 that trigger over other parties.

MR. BUTLER: Correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BUTLER: The other piece of this obviously, Your Honor, is in connection with the support -- from the debtor's perspective the support GM is providing here is related to the advances that the company has made under the GSA and the MRA whereas is clear from the agreement, we are negotiating the circumstances under which the GSA and the MRA should become effective and I think GM reasonably requested from the company assurances that if we decided to take a very different path than General Motors and essentially from their perspective go hostile, they want to be able to say, I probably shouldn't provide any more support under this agreement.

THE COURT: Right. No, I understand that. I just wanted to make sure it didn't go beyond that and create an event of default.

1 MR. BUTLER: No. 2 THE COURT: Okay. Does anyone have anything further to 3 say on this motion? MR. ROSENBERG: Only, Your Honor, that that last point 4 5 that you have been making was very hotly contested and we are 6 satisfied that it's now properly drafted to what it should be. 7 Okay. All right. Well, therefore, based on THE COURT: 8 the record and the fact that this motion is now obviously 9 uncontested, I'll approve it. 10 MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Your Honor. We'll be submitting 11 a revised order to Your Honor later today. 12 THE COURT: Okay. 13 MR. BUTLER: Thank you. 14 Your Honor, the next matter on the agenda is the 15 Kettering Sale motion at docket No. 13028. We're here to seek 16 approval for the sale of certain assets of Delphi Automotive 17 Systems, LLC that consist of machinery, equipment and inventory 18 primarily used and located at DAS, LLC's Damper manufacturing 19 facility in Kettering, Ohio to Tenneco Automotive Operating 20 Company, Inc., the stalking horse bidder. This was a stalking 21 horse that was approved under a bidding procedures order that Your 22 Honor considered at a prior hearing on March 20th and entered at 23 docket No. 13188. 24 Your Honor, there was a bid deadline established of 25 April 10, 2008 with respect to this proposed sale. The debtors did not receive any additional bids, therefore, no auction was held and we are here today to seek approval of the sale of the Kettering assets for approximately \$18.8 million and other consideration as that price may be adjusted based on the inventory value, that is the purchase price as well as entering into a lease agreement for a portion of the Kettering facility in connection with the sale as we have described previously and as the papers before the Court indicate.

The form of the lease is attached to the sale agreement as Exhibit A. As I've indicated to Your Honor at the original hearing, this is not a sale of a business, it's rather a sale of assets. The result of that is that there are no pre-petition executory contracts that are assumed or assigned as part of this particular transaction, although we are considering whether some post-petition supply agreements might ultimately be assigned. That is not a part of today's hearing.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, we have made a few changes to the proposed sale order, we filed and served a notice of these changes along with a redline on April 28th at docket No. 13473. We also with Tenneco's help found a scribner's error in Paragraph 19 of the order. We reflected that in the version of the order we sent to chambers last evening and are set forth in the trial exhibits which I'll describe in a moment.

The four specific changes that were made included at

Paragraph I, we added a provision to explicitly find that the sale order and the consummation of the transactions were supported by good business reasons and served the best interests of the estate. At Paragraph 6 of the order we added language so that it now states it will be binding not only on the seller but the reorganized debtors after the effective date of the plan surviving discharge claims under the plan. At Paragraph 7 it was made explicit that any modification of the agreement, any related documents needed to be in writing signed by the parties and in accordance with the terms of the agreement and at Paragraph 19 it is now noted that the transactions contemplated by the agreement are undertaken at arm's length and without collusion.

In terms of the exhibits that we have in support of this, there are thirteen of them, they include a declaration from Mr. Sheehan at Exhibit 1, Exhibits 2 and 3 are the form of sale and purchase agreement and the form of lease agreement. Exhibits 4 through 7 are various of the proposed court documents. Exhibits 8 through 12 are all the notices and affidavit of publications and, importantly, at Exhibit 13 made available to the Court and marked "Highly Confidential," is a memorandum of understanding regarding the transfer of the Kettering operations and the effect upon employees which is a memorandum of understanding that has been worked out with the IUECWA.

THE COURT: So that resolved their potential objections.

MR. BUTLER: That resolved their potential objection on

. 1	the issues and that effects MOU is confidential but has resolved
2	those issues.
3	THE COURT: Okay.
4	MR. BUTLER: So, Your Honor, I'd like to move admission
5	of Exhibits 1 through 13 into the record.
6	THE COURT: Okay. Does anyone want to cross-examine Mr.
7	Sheehan on his affidavit?
8	(No response)
9	(Debtor's Exhibit Nos. 1 through 13, Received)
10	THE COURT: All right. I'll admit those exhibits into
11	the record into evidence.
12	MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Your Honor.
13	Your Honor, in light of that on the record here we'd ask
14	that the Court approve the sale of the Kettering assets to Tenneco
15	under the terms provided for in the sale and purchase agreement and
16	find that Tenneco is a good faith purchaser under 363(m) of the
17	Bankruptcy Code and for consideration to be provided by Tenneco for
18	the acquired assets is fair and reasonable and the sale may not be
19	avoided under Section 363(m) of the Bankruptcy Code.
20	THE COURT: Okay. I can make all those findings based
21	on the record before me.
22	MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: Okay. So does anyone have any there are
24	no objections to this so no one is going to say anything on it.
25	MR. BUTLER: No, Your Honor.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I'll approve the motion, again, as being unopposed and based upon my findings as set forth in the proposed order which I'm perfectly comfortable with. MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Your Honor. Might I have just one moment? THE COURT: I think the sale agreement is supposed to be an exhibit to the order and I'm not sure that we have that so you probably ought to e-mail that to us. MR. BUTLER: We'll submit that. MALE VOICE: Thank you, Your Honor. MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, we have two contested matters on today's docket, they're both claims objections and we're only proceeding on the uncontested portions of them at this hearing. Item No. 8 is the Twenty-Eighth omnibus objection at docket No. 13269. There were nine proofs of claim addressed on the objection that the debtors filed. The debtors received two

docket No. 13269. There were nine proofs of claim addressed on the objection that the debtors filed. The debtors received two docketed responses involving five proofs of claim and as a result today we're proceeding for relief only with respect to the uncontested portion of the Twenty-Eighth omnibus claims objection. It covers four claims asserting liquidated claims of approximately \$1.1 million and we're seeking to expunge all four of those claims.

We have, Your Honor, continued our practice of providing particularized notice of the objection and if Your Honor grants the relief as to the uncontested claimants we'll provide particularized notice of the relief obtained today.

As to the five claims, proofs of claim as to which responses were filed, creating a contested matter, we'll put those over on to the claims track in connection with the claims procedures order.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll grant the unopposed relief sought based on due notice, no opposition and the averments in the objection.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, Item 9 on the agenda is the debtor's Twenty-Ninth omnibus claims objection. This particular objection involves the debtor's seeking expungement or modification of certain claims because those claims were satisfied in whole or in part by cure payments made by the debtors filing the assumption and assignment under Section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code of executory contracts or unexpired leases pursuant to the sale of the debtor's interiors and closures business. This relief is necessary to eliminate multiple recoveries for a single liability to insure that a claim holder will not realize recovery on account of a default that has already been satisfied through a cure payment.

This objection dealt with seventeen proofs of claim. In connection with the seventeen proofs of claim we received two responses covering two proofs of claim in the amount of \$408,000.00 and we'll adjourn those to the claims track in connection with the claims procedures order. Of the remaining fifteen claims, they asserted liquidated damages of approximately \$10.9 million; twelve

of those claims had been modified on prior orders so pursuant to other orders of the Court the aggregate amount of these claims actually -- the face amount is \$10.9 million, they've already been reduced to \$7.8 million.

With respect to these fifteen claims the debtors seek to expunge three of the claims with an assertive aggregate amount of about \$1.5 million and with respect to the twelve claims we would seek to reduce the amounts owing under those claims to an aggregate of approximately \$5 million and that is a reduction of just about \$3 million from the reduced amount based on the prior orders of the Court.

So, again, Your Honor, here we have given particularized notice of this objection to the claim holders involved. With respect to the two responses, those go the claims track. With respect to the fifteen remaining claims, we're asking for relief today to have three of them expunged and twelve of them modified as I've indicated on the record.

THE COURT: Okay. Again, based on due notice and lack of an objection and the statements made in the objection by the debtors I will grant the unopposed claim objections sought today.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, finally, Item 10 on the agenda is an adversary proceeding involving the debtor's complaint to recover property of the estate, adversary proceeding No. 08-01038, and we have been dealing with the initial scheduling conference and this

```
. 1
      involves a FICA refund complaint between the company and the
 2
      Internal Revenue Service.
 3
                The IRS has continued to request additional time from
 4
      the debtors to prepare its answer and we are cooperating with that
 5
      request and, therefore, Your Honor, we would ask that you adjourn
 6
      the initial scheduling conference until the May omnibus.
 7
               THE COURT: Okay. I'll do that.
 8
               MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Your Honor.
                Your Honor, that represents the matters that were
 9
10
      scheduled for a hearing at this Thirtieth omnibus hearing.
11
                THE COURT: Okay. Very well.
12
                MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Your Honor.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

. 1	CERTIFICATION
2	
3	I certify that the foregoing is a transcript from an
4	electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the
5	above-entitled matter taken on April 30, 2008, except
6	where, as indicated, the Court has modified the transcript.
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	Conla Nutter 5/2/08
13	Carla Nutter Date
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	